IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 2483 of 1999

Between:

D.V.Ramana **..... PETITIONER**

AND

1.The Regional Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C. Srikakulam Region,
Srikakulam dist.
2 .The A.P.S.R.T.C. Rep. by its Vice Chairman & Managing

Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS.

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO. 2483 OF 1999

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed seeking direction to the respondents to absorb the petitioner in the post of Conductor in the Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation.

In the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, it is stated that the petitioner was working as conductor on the private buses bearing registration No. MTS 264, and AAK 267, which were being plied on the route, from Meeredi barrage to Sankili. It is the case of the petitioner that the said route was nationalized with effect from 27-4-

1988. It is his further case that though benefit of absorption was given to the employees who were working on the nationalized routes, but, the said benefit is not extended to him.

In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, it is stated that the routes in Srikakulam district were nationalized with effect from 12-11-1987 and there was list of private buses plied on the routes which were nationalized in the Srikakulam district, but, however, the vehicles as stated by the petitioner did not figure in the said list. It is further stated that there is ban on absorption and recruitment of displaced employees into the service of the Corporation, to reduce the staff ratio on par with other Road Transport Corporations in India.

Though the routes in Srikakulam District were nationalized in the year 1987, but, the petitioner did not move at all in the matter and this Writ Petition is filed in the year 1999. Further, it is stated in the counter affidavit that the buses on which the petitioner claimed to have served as conductor did not figure in the list prepared by the respondent authorities. Even in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, there is no indication that the petitioner has approached the respondents at any point of time, prior to the filing of the Writ Petition. In that view of the matter, and, further, in view of the stand of the respondents, that in the list prepared, the buses, in which the petitioner worked as conductor, did not figure, no relief can be granted. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits.

The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

DATED: 02-09-2005.

Msnr.